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Author’s response to reviews:

Editor Comments:

1. Please rename your 'Introduction' section 'Background.'

Response: This correction has been completed.

2. We notice that authors Dimitrios Marinos and Mitchell Baker are missing from the authors’ contributions section. In addition the initials BS do not respond to any author in the author list. Please ensure the individual contributions of all authors to the manuscript are be specified in the Authors’ Contributions section. Guidance and criteria for authorship can be found here:

http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship

Response: We have corrected the authors’ contribution section to include Dimitrius Marinos and Mitchell Baker.
Reviewer reports:

Paul Brown (Reviewer 1): Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

Response: We appreciate the initial feedback from the Reviewer and assume there are no additional comments.

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 3): PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Yes - current version is technically sound
GENERAL COMMENTS: Overall impression of the revised manuscript: This is an interesting paper which will attract attention from clinicians, trialists and general methodologists based on its interesting approach to determining the appropriateness of composite end-points for a challenging population to research. Overall, the amendments have improved the paper and address all major concerns addressed.

Authors done well: The authors have addressed the excellent comments which were raised by the previous reviewers. The authors have produced a methodologically robust paper which has clinical application.

Not meet best practice: Nil of note. I support this paper as it presently stands.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

The authors should be commended for addressing the comments made by the previous reviewers. The revised version is a strong paper. I have no concerns regarding the methodology addressed and do not feel it appropriate to raise any additional points at this stage in the paper's progress. I support the paper as it currently stands from a methodological and clinical perspective.

Response: We thank the Reviewer for their very helpful feedback in the initial review and appreciate the compliments provided in this review.